

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/707,526	12/19/2003	Patrick C. Urschel	A3-1700 1525		
27127	7590 08/29/2005		EXAMINER		
HARTMAN & HARTMAN, P.C. 552 EAST 700 NORTH			CHOI, STEPHEN		
VALPARAISO, IN 46383			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724		

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/707,526		URSCHEL ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		

Advisory Action	10/707,526	URSCHEL ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	 			
	Stephen Choi	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 05 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on seen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension as CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL). which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the) and the appropriate exte The appropriate extensio final Office action; or (2)	nsion fee have n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a):					
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)						
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	vided below or appended.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessare.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeary and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on or the status of the claims after t	entry is below or attac	neu.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered busee continuation.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	•			
		STEPHEN CH PRIMARY EXAM				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

applicants contend that Leo does not teach the material being free-fall through a cutting means since applicant's interpretation of Leo's extrusion step is to be performed with the plunger 24 to be consistent with the ordinary meaning of the word "extrusion". The examiner respectfully disagrees. According to Merriam-Webster dictionary, "extrude" means 1. to force, press, or push out or 2. to shape (as metal or plastic) by forcing through a die. Leo teaches that the material can fall by gravity or by a plunger onto the plate and can be diced by a die 50. The step of dicing is performed prior to reaching the plate. This clearly teaches that the material can be forced through the die by force of gravity. Such teachings satisfy the limitation "free-fall through the cutting means" set forth in claims 1 and 14